WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY SUPPLEMENTARY SHEET

International application No.
PCT/EP2005/050517

Re: Point V.

1. Reference is made to the following documents:
D1: EP-A-0 936 561 B1 (SIEMENS AKTIENGESELLSCHAFT) August 18, 1999
D2: US 2002/157017 B2 (PEI WEI MI ET AL) October 24, 2002

2. This application does not meet the requirements of PCT Article 33(1), because the subject matter of claim 1 does not involve an inventive step within the meaning of PCT Article 33(3).

2.1 Document D1, which is regarded as the closest prior art, discloses (the references in parentheses relate to this document):

a method for conducting a medical study (Abstract), an event occurring during the study (column 7, paragraph [0028], planned event '*study- and time-dependently*'), with the following steps:

- the event is communicated to a process control system (column 7, paragraph [0028], '*study process control module*')
- the process control system, on the basis of parameters assigned to the event, identifies a person responsible for the task (column 7, paragraph [0028], '*medical site*') who is required for a measure (examination, treatment, etc.)
- the medical site carries out the measures,
- the process control system checks the performance on the basis of preestablished verification criteria (column 8, paragraph [0029], '*require... reporting-back* '
- '*in the event of noncompliance with a preestablished deadline*'.

2.2 The subject matter of claim 1 therefore differs from the known method in that it exhibits the following features:
- a collaboration system rather than a study process control system,
- a group of responsible study personnel required for collaboration is identified, and
- a communications platform for carrying out the collaboration is provided for the group.

2.3 The objective technical problem to be solved thus consists in the creation of an event-monitoring method that makes it possible for responsible personnel in charge of the study to cooperate in the requisite way.

2.4 However, these features have already been employed for the same purpose in a similar method, cf. document D2, which is concerned with event-monitoring methods in business task processes.

D2 describes in particular (the references in parentheses relate to this document):
a method for conducting and monitoring a task process (page 1, right-hand column, lines 2-4) during which an event necessitating collaboration of persons responsible for the task occurs, with the following steps:
- the event is communicated to a collaboration system (page 5, paragraph [0069], lines 8-15)
- the collaboration system, on the basis of parameters assigned to the event, identifies a group of persons responsible for the task who are needed for the collaboration (page 5, paragraph [0069], lines 15-28).
- the collaboration system provides a communications platform for the group (page 5, paragraph [0070]),
- the group undertakes the collaboration using the communications platform,
- the collaboration system checks the collaboration on the basis of preestablished verification criteria (page 16, paragraph [0137]).

2.5 If a person skilled in the art wishes to achieve the same purpose using a method in accordance with document D1, he can readily also apply the features with the corresponding effect in the subject matter of D1. In this way he would arrive at a method as per claim 1 without thereby being inventive.

3. DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-11

Claims 2-11 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the PCT requirements for novelty and inventive step.

4. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

The subject matter of the present claim 1 includes, in some embodiments, methods for business activities (particularly in view of the definition of the 'collaboration system' as consisting of a '*service provider in charge of the clinical study*').